DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 377 671 EC 303 600

TITLE	Toward a Common Agenda: Linking Gifted Education and School Reform.
INSTITUTION	Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, Va.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
REPORT NO	ISBN-0-86586-260-5
PUB DATE	95
CONTRACT	R206A20102-93A
NOTE	42p.; A product of the National Training Program for Gifted Education. (Derived from a symposium held May 20-21, 1994).
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091-1589 ($18.50, $13 members; package with video M5089, "Gifted Education and School Reform: Making the Connection," $125, $87.50 members).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents; *Change Strategies; *Educational Change; *Educational Objectives; Educational Philosophy; Educational Trends; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; Inclusive Schools; *School Restructuring; Staff Development; Student Centered Curriculum; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

Based on a 1994 symposium and intended to be used with a video, this monograph attempts to bring together the perspectives of gifted education and school reform. Individual chapters address the following topics: (1) changes in gifted education, changes in general education, the need to find a balance, a history of tensions, and remaining tensions; (2) common elements and shared contributions of gifted education and school reform, uncertainties, and unresolved issues; (3) sources of power for change, top-down versus bottom-up change strategies, and shared lessons on change; (4) inclusive schools, and expanding perspectives in gifted education and school reform; (5) the student-centered school, high-level learning experiences, and tailoring instruction to fit the learner; (6) reconfiguring time and rethinking staff development; (7) barriers to cooperation and steps to building bridges. Appended are a list of symposium participants and a list of related materials from the ERIC Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education. (Contains 16 references.) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 377 671

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

A PRODUCT OF THE
NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR GIFTED EDUCATION

TOWARD A COMMON AGENDA

EC 303600

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Council for Exceptional Children

CEC: Leading the Way
The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC) is the largest professional organization internationally committed to improving educational outcomes for individuals with exceptionalities. CEC accomplishes its worldwide mission on behalf of educators and others working with children with exceptionalities by advocating for appropriate government policies; setting professional standards; providing continuing professional development; and assisting professionals to obtain conditions and resources necessary for effective professional practice.

CEC: The Unifying Force of a Diverse Field
The Council for Exceptional Children, a private nonprofit membership organization, was established in 1922. CEC is an active network of 59 State/Provincial Federations, 900 Chapters, 17 Specialized Divisions, and 275 Subdivisions with reach in over 40 countries.

The CEC Information Center:
International Resource for Topics in Special and Gifted Education
The Council for Exceptional Children is a major publisher of special education literature and produces a comprehensive catalog semiannually. Journals such as *TEACHING Exceptional Children* (published quarterly) and *Exceptional Children* (published 6 times per year) reach over 100,000 readers and provide a wealth of information on the latest teaching strategies, research, resources, and special education news.

CEC's National Training Program for Gifted Education project is proud to release *Toward a Common Agenda: Linking Gifted Education and School Reform.*

The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive • Reston, Virginia 22091
703/620-3660 (Voice)
703/264-9446 (TDD)
703/264-9494 (Fax)

PUBLISHED BY

THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN

A PRODUCT OF THE
NATIONAL TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR GIFTED EDUCATION

TOWARD A COMMON AGENDA

Linking Gifted Education and School Reform

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Toward a common agenda : linking gifted education and school reform : a product of the National Training Program for Gifted Education.
p. cm.
Derived from a symposium held May 20–21, 1994, sponsored by the Council for Exceptional Children.
Includes bibliographical references.
ISBN 0-86586-260-5
1. Gifted children—Education—United States—Congresses. 2. Educational change—United States—Congresses. I. National Training Program for Gifted Education. II. Council for Exceptional Children.
LC3993.9.T67 1994
371.95—dc20 94–42218
CIP

Published in 1995 by The Council for Exceptional Children,
1920 Association Drive, Reston, Virginia 22091-1589

Stock No. P5088

Printed in the United States of America

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

PREFACE vii

CHAPTER 1
EXAMINING THE PIECES AND FUNDAMENTAL TENSIONS 1
Changes in gifted education; changes in general education; the need to find a balance; A history of tensions; the tensions remain

CHAPTER 2
HOW DO WE WANT TO HANG THIS TOGETHER? 7
Common elements, shared contributions; uncertain dimensions, unresolved issues

CHAPTER 3
SOURCES OF POWER FOR CHANGE 11
The pull from the top versus the pull from the bottom; shared lessons on change

CHAPTER 4
EXPANDING PERSPECTIVES: INCLUSIVE SCHOOLS 13
Expanding perspectives in gifted education; expanding perspectives in school reform; a common perspective

CHAPTER 5
THE POINT OF BALANCE: BECOMING STUDENT CENTERED 15
Sensitivity to student traits and needs; response through high-level learning experiences; tailoring instruction to fit the learner

CHAPTER 6
DYNAMICS OF DESIGN 17
Reconfiguring time; rethinking staff development

CHAPTER 7
FROM IMBALANCE TO BALANCE: HANGING TOGETHER 19
Barriers to cooperation; steps to building bridges; a final note

REFERENCES 23

APPENDIX A
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS 25

APPENDIX B
ERIC DIGEST AND MINI-BIBS 29
Blending Gifted Education and School Reform: Gifted Education and School Reform: Selected Readings; Educational Restructuring: Selected Readings

Acknowledgments

To the writers of and contributors to *Toward a Common Agenda: Linking Gifted Education and School Reform,* we extend our sincere appreciation for bringing their knowledge, experience, and expertise to this effort.

It is with much gratitude that we acknowledge Patricia O'Connell-Ross for her assistance in identifying states whose programs are striving to bring together the perspectives of gifted education and school reform. We wish to thank Bruce Boston for creating a framework for organizing the presentations and discussions heard at the symposium. And we especially want to thank Carol Tomlinson, the author of this book, who assembled the thoughts, reflections, inspirations, and recommendations into a document that is balanced and graceful.

The Project also wishes to acknowledge the assistance of The Council for Exceptional Children's publications staff for their support throughout the development and preparation of this book.

Felice A. Kaufmann
Project Director

The development of this product was supported under the Javits Act Program (Grant No. R206A20102-93A) as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. Grantees undertaking such projects are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment. This report, therefore, does not necessarily represent positions or policies of the Government, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Preface

On May 20–21, 1994, The Council for Exceptional Children hosted a symposium that brought together leaders in the fields of gifted education and school reform to explore perspectives and derive, if possible, a working agenda for ways the two groups could work together to meet their goals. The symposium was supported by CEC's National Training Program for Gifted Education project under a grant provided by the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Program. The symposium took place at the Wye Conference Center in Maryland and was facilitated by the staff of the Aspen Institute.

The symposium began with presentations by 12 panelists, all leaders in the field of gifted education or education reform.

Panelists Representing Gifted Education

Pat O'Connell Ross, Director, Office of Gifted and Talented, OERI

Gail E. Hanninen, President, CEC's The Association for the Gifted

James J. Gallagher, President, National Association for Gifted Children

Evelyn L. Hiatt, President, Council of State Directors of Programs for the Gifted

Joseph S. Renzulli, Director, National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented

Bessie R. Duncan, Program Supervisor, Gifted and Talented Education, Detroit Public Schools

Panelists Representing School Reform

Charles E. Patterson, President-Elect, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development

Paula M. Evans, Director, National Re:Learning Faculty Project, Coalition of Essential Schools

Henry M. Levin, Director, National Center for The Accelerated Schools Project

Barby Halstead-Worrell, Director of Teacher TV/National Center for Innovation, National Education Association

Frank B. Withrow, Director of Learning Technologies, Council of Chief State School Officers

Patricia Free Brett, Director, Community Outreach and Leadership, Quality Education for Minorities

Reactors and discussants representing national associations and teams of educators from seven states that are in the vanguard of education reform responded to the presentations and addressed related concerns and ideas. Participating states were selected by The Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (Participants are listed in Appendix A.)

To capture the process, the symposium was videotaped and notetakers recorded key concepts. The products of these 2 days of intense interaction are a video, *Gifted Education and School Reform: Making the Connection*, and this book. While all the ideas in both the book and the video were derived from the symposium, the selection of what to present and how to present it rested with the writers and editors and may not reflect what any individual participant would have selected.

These products are designed to serve as catalysts for discussions at local, state, and national levels. Participants in the symposium discovered that they had much in common and much to share. It is our hope that experience can be repeated so that educators everywhere will be able to find the common agenda that will best serve all children and youth.

The metaphor of a mobile emerged as a way to link gifted education and school reform. It was clear that at this stage there was not a mixture or blend of the ideologies of gifted and reform educators. What we did have was a collection of concepts, interests, and approaches that could be

brought into balance for the good of the student. We hope this metaphor will serve you as you create the structure for delivering services to your most able learners within the school reform context.

SUGGESTIONS FOR USING THE VIDEOTAPE

Audiences

Policymakers, parent groups, educators-in-training, all teachers, principals, supervisors, and school board members who are struggling with ways to serve gifted and talented students in the climate of school reform can benefit from this videotape.

Overview

The video provides the point-counterpoint of leaders of gifted education and school reform as they present diverse views about strategies and programs. Approximately 50 minutes in length, this fast-paced program addresses three issues:

1. Dimensions of the problem.
2. Defining how we change.
3. The connection with gifted education.

The video can be stopped after each section for discussion and comment. Presenters serve as models for ways to address the issues and solutions in productive ways.

CHAPTER 1

Examining the Pieces and Tensions

Changes in Gifted Education

Like all other areas of education, the field of gifted education has evolved over time as a result of experience, research, and societal forces. In the past 2 decades, significant changes have taken place in gifted education. Understanding this evolution is useful in understanding the juncture at which educators of the gifted and school reformers now find themselves.

In 1972, the Marland Report to Congress on gifted and talented education noted a serious dearth of appropriate educational programs for learners of high ability. The Marland Report proposed that approximately 3% to 5% of U.S. students should be identified as gifted. From 1972 to 1981, the federal government provided direct support to education of gifted learners.

State mandates and funding for programs for gifted students have increased over the past 2 decades, with funding rising over 48% in the last half of the 1980s alone. Currently all but six states and territories have legislation that either mandates or encourages specialized services for gifted students. In more recent years, however, state funding for education of gifted learners has been reduced.

In 1988, the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Education Act reestablished a federal role in education of gifted learners by providing funding for research and innovative practice in the education of gifted learners, with special focus on high ability learners in culturally and linguistically diverse and low socioeconomic groups.

In 1993, *National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent* was released by the U.S. Office of Education, indicating that policies alone have not been adequate to address the learning needs of gifted and talented youngsters. The report signaled that problems still abound in educating gifted and talented learners. For example,

- Most schools have not been committed to addressing seriously the learning needs of gifted and talented students.
- Most gifted and talented programs are modest in scope.
- Only about $.02 of every $100 spent on K–12 education in the United States support special learning opportunities for gifted and talented students.
- Many highly able students from culturally and linguistically diverse and low socioeconomic groups are not identified and served in programs for gifted learners.
- Most specialized programs for gifted and talented learners are available only a few hours a week.
- Students who are talented in the arts are offered few challenging opportunities.
- In most regular classrooms, little is done to modify curriculum and instruction for gifted students.
- Most academically gifted students have mastered up to half of the required curriculum in elementary school before it is formally offered to them.
- Appropriate learning opportunities for gifted learners in middle schools are scattered and uncoordinated. Many have been eliminated altogether.
- High school curricula and schedules typically fall short of challenging gifted secondary students.
- Compared to their ability, talented students fare poorly on national and international tests, indicating that talented high school stu-

dents in the United States are being held to lower standards than their foreign counterparts.

- The poor relative performance of top elementary and high school students in the United States continues on into college, graduate school, and the professional world.

The past two decades, then, have seen some encouraging awareness of and support for education of gifted and talented learners in the United States. At the same time, results have not provided cause for celebration. A need for more meaningful change in the education of gifted and talented learners is evident. The lack of success of traditional ways of conceiving and practicing the education of gifted students has led many in the field of gifted education to replace old assumptions with more promising ones. Some of these assumptions follow:

- The Marland Report was based on the assumption that the regular school program was basically sound. That assumption has proven incorrect.
- Most programming for gifted learners has been based on "pull-out" models popularized by special education and remedial education programs. Those models are being brought into question for many learners of varying academic profiles, including the gifted.
- Many programs for gifted learners have attempted to function separately from the regular classroom and curriculum. The separation has resulted in nonessential curricula and easy elimination of the special programs.
- Single test-score identification has predominated. More recent understandings of the pluralistic nature of intelligence make the older identification models unacceptable.

> Lots of times we're satisfied with the responses we get from students simply because they're higher than our expectations were, but that doesn't mean that the [students have] given *all* that they can give. I fear that we have a lot of students who think that A's are cheap, that excellence is easy, because that's the message we're giving them.
>
> **Evelyn L. Hiatt**

- Earlier models of identification and service have failed to find and appropriately nurture culturally diverse learners with high ability.
- Inordinate efforts and resources have been placed on "accurate" and "exclusive" identification of learners with high ability. Considerably less focus has been placed on curriculum and instruction for these learners. A wiser use of resources would lead to concentration on ability development and inclusion of a much broader student population in such learning experiences.

Changes in General Education

The past two decades in the *general* educational environment have also been marked by changing perspectives and calls for improved teaching and learning. From the national educational report called *A Nation at Risk* (U.S. Department of Education, 1983) to *America 2000* (U.S. Department of Education, 1991), calls for overhauls of education have escalated. The movement to bring about systemic change in U.S. schools is known as *educational reform*. The educational reform movement is multifaceted and complex, with a variety of agendas and voices. In general, however, reform seeks to make radical changes in the way schools are administered, the way teachers and administrators are trained, and the way classrooms operate. Among the many factors prompting reform efforts are the following:

- The student population of the United States is increasingly diverse, while schools tend to persist in reflecting a middle class, European view of the world.

- Students from culturally diverse and low socioeconomic status homes are often poorly served in schools.
- Schools persist in using models, schedules, and frameworks that were developed at a time in our history when our society was agrarian and industrial. Most graduates needed to know how to work on farms and assembly lines. Now most graduates need to know how to think, solve problems, provide services, adapt to change, and work as part of a team.
- Highly centralized methods of governing schools have proven ineffective, and there is a need to return power and authority of governance to the educators who are closest to the students in whose behalf educational decisions must be made.
- Breakthroughs in brain research have shown us that behavioristic models of teaching lead to fragmented learning, schoolwork that seems irrelevant to young learners, and emphasis on rote recall of information rather than on understanding and the ability to use information for problem solving.
- Classrooms tend to be teacher centered rather than student centered, resulting in abdication of student responsibility for learning and student disaffection with school.
- Teacher education programs typically produce teachers and administrators who reproduce school as they knew it rather than professionals who function as change agents.

School reformers suggest that outdated paradigms of schooling must give way to new ways of "doing school" that reflect the realities of contemporary society, our best understanding of how children learn, and insights into organizational effectiveness. In response to these criticisms, new structures and strategies are being tried including middle schools, cooperative learning, subject-area restructuring, interdisciplinary instruction, authentic assessment, inclusion of special education students in regular classrooms, reliance on heterogeneous grouping of students, continuous-progress classrooms, site-based management, reduction of central office administrative staffs, national educational goals, and new standards for teacher education and licensing.

> I hope we *all* are student centered at heart! If we can focus on individual needs of students, no one can defend *not* meeting the needs of gifted as well as others in the context of reform.
>
> **Jody Hess**

The Need to Find a Balance

Gifted education and school reform share a desire to meet the needs of all learners and to help them achieve their potential. Beyond that essential commonality, areas of concern for the two groups overlap in other important ways. Certainly gifted learners are harmed, as are other learners, by lifeless classrooms, splintered instruction, emphasis on recall of lower-level information rather than on critical thought and application of ideas, teachers who are ill-prepared to deal with shifts in societal patterns, inefficiently administered schools, and so on. Educators of gifted students, then, have a clear interest in achieving positive school change. Likewise, educational reformers seek to enhance the quality of education in the United States. A part of achieving the goal is ensuring that ceilings are raised for learners of high ability as well as for others. Furthermore, many principles of gifted education are currently advocated by reformers for broad classroom application, and practitioners in gifted education could be effective catalysts for expanded use of those principles in all classrooms. In short, the two fields could have considerable mutual benefit.

While gifted education and school reform share many similar goals, there are some basic differences between the two groups that cause tension. The essential focus of school reform on opportunity to achieve for *all* students—the "equity" perspective—has made reformers wary of gifted education's commitment to special treatment for the most able students—the "excellence" perspective. Gifted education has been defensive about reform practices that may have the potential to improve school for many learners but often seem to be applied in ways that do not address the special needs of gifted learners. Moreover, educators of the gifted have felt excluded from reform dialogues and have therefore concluded that re-

formers do not have the best interests of gifted learners at heart.

At a time when the degree of educational change desirable would challenge the best efforts of all educators, it is divisive and disadvantageous for groups of educators to take adversarial roles. With the goal in mind of opening a dialogue between these two groups, The Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), through its National Training Program, hosted a 2-day meeting in May, 1994. A skilled facilitator from the Aspen Institute helped the groups search for common ground and establish an agenda for dialogue and shared action. Said one symposium participant, "We had better learn to live and work together." Another added, "Gifted education can work without impeding reforms desired by school reformers, and reform does not have to be an enemy of gifted education."

Emerging from the symposium were three shared goals of both gifted education and school reform: (1) an opportunity for all students to learn at their highest levels; (2) flexibility in planning and use of time in order to address diverse needs of learners, and (3) instructional clarity and high standards. From these common principles, conversation and shared action seem possible. They provide "the way ahead."

A History of Tensions

The United States is continually in search of a fulcrum that can balance the competing values of equity and excellence. It is a nation made great by the opportunity for individuals to give birth to unique ideas and parent them to fruition. Thoreau spoke to these ideals, commending the value of individual excellence, when he noted the importance of being allowed to march to a different drummer. On the other hand, the Declaration of Independence insists that "all men are created equal." So from our earliest days as a country, we have struggled to balance the right of individuals to become all they can be and the need to ensure equal opportunity to all citizens. Our birthright includes a fundamental tension between equity and excellence.

In 1840, Alexis de Tocqueville characterized the United States as a country suspicious of intellect. He said we gravitate toward a "middling" standard that favors conformity over being different from the norm. He suggested that the reason for the deemphasis of education and intellectual talent was a fear of hierarchies that might stand in the way of success for individuals who were lower on the hierarchical ladders.

In the 1960s, John Gardner (1961) suggested that the equity-excellence struggle was still alive and well as he chronicled our love-hate relationship with individual excellence. Difference in human capacity is a reality, he insisted, adding that a nation that fails to value and develop excellence in its most able citizens is foolish. On the other hand, he admonished, excellence should be cultivated in all people, to the highest degree possible.

In the 1970s, Richard Hofstadter (1970) reflected that intellect in the United States is resented as a variety of excellence because it challenges our notions of equity and seems to rob the person of the common touch.

The Tensions Remain

National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent (U.S. Department of Education, 1993) recounts stories of high-ability youngsters who have learned how to do well in school, but not *too* well. To perform too well is to sacrifice popularity. Bright learners from culturally diverse groups are accused of selling out and "acting white" if they excel in school. Even our young know the pressure to balance achievement with egalitarianism, excellence with equity.

Much of the tension between educators of the gifted and school reformers comes from the nation's long discomfort with this excellence/equity struggle. At its core, school reform is an equity movement. Much of the motivation for school reform efforts stems from the inability of schools (and society) to adequately address needs of learners who are at risk for failure. The compass that guides decision making and policy development for reformers is set squarely on an equity course. Heterogeneous grouping, cooperative learning, middle school, continuous-progress classes, authentic assessment, inclusion, and many other reform efforts have as their primary objective ensuring equity of educational opportunity for students who are at risk. Most reformers feel passionately that equity must be championed in schools.

On the other hand, the field of gifted education has as a key element in its mission a need to champion high-end excellence. The very "elite" talent often shunned by the nation's egalitarian instincts is the pole on which the compass of gifted education is established. Therefore, initiatives that

appear to discourage or suppress development of high-end excellence are rejected by educators of gifted children.

Although equity and excellence *are* different values in tension with each other, they are not opposite poles of the same continuum. The following are several places where the values of equity and excellence intersect and allow a coming together of their standard-bearers.

- The equity/excellence tension is not a problem to be solved. Rather it is a dynamic tension that makes our country unique. A problem arises not when the two values compete for room at the policy-making table, but rather when either value is excluded from the conversation.
- Fully exercised, excellence would include maximizing modest talent as well as extraordinary talent. Therefore, gifted education should be concerned with talent development in all of our young people.
- Fully exercised, equity would ensure opportunities for gifted students as well as students who are at risk to learn at the highest possible levels.
- Among learners at risk are many who have tremendous talent in a variety of domains. School reform and gifted education are on compelling common ground in understanding and serving these learners who embody both excellence and equity needs.
- There are energy, insight, creativity, and strength to be had in joining the forces for excellence and equity in an effort to create more effective schools. The dual perspectives of talent development and equity hold the answers to genuine school reform.
- Policymakers tell us that excellence and equity can be achieved simultaneously if we find the economic will to support them. Rather than fostering an adversarial relationship, the fields of gifted education and school reform could provide joint leadership in making the case that our nation has no wiser investment opportunity than one that provides both quality and access to quality for all its young.
- Equity is about raising floors. Excellence is about raising ceilings. Restructuring of schools should be about both. There is value in attending simultaneously to the perspectives and agendas of gifted education and school reform.

> If we have equality, we can have liberty, we can have efficiency, we can have community, but we've got to have a chance first to get our foot in the door.
>
> **Stuart Tonemah**

CHAPTER 2

How Do We Want to Hang This Together?

That many classrooms and many schools fall short of engaging the energies and imaginations of the students who populate them is hardly a new or startling statement. Teachers are often ill equipped to teach the subjects to which they are assigned (Toch, 1991). Lacking rich content understanding, teachers are unable to lead students to high-level investigations of intriguing issues in those subjects (Goodlad, 1984). Rather than forming a coherent view of key concepts in a subject, curricula tend to be disjointed (Brady, 1989). Monosyllabic texts and test-driven instruction further sap both the liveliness and the connectedness of content. This leads to a sort of paint-by-number approach to covering shallow bits of information that will be called for on fact-based end-of-year tests (Toch, 1991). Overwhelmed by large numbers of students, multiple demands, and fragmented time blocks, teachers are discouraged (Nehring, 1989), and they teach to the middle of the ability range in the class (Welsh, 1986). Students wait passively for the passage of time, which typically results in the granting of a diploma—not so much because of demonstrated competence as because the appropriate amount of time has been served (Sarason, 1990; Sizer, 1992).

> The bottom line for teachers is really to have mastery of the teaching-learning process. What does it mean? What are the dynamics of it? What does it look like?
>
> **Gail E. Hanninen**

Much of school reform efforts are aimed at restructuring and revitalizing classrooms so that ideas are more compelling, students are more motivated, and teachers are more empowered to make decisions that facilitate learning. Says reformer Theodore Sarason (1990), "If reform efforts are not powered by altered conceptions of what children are and what makes them tick and keeps them intellectually alive, willingly pursuing knowledge and growth, their results will be inconsequential" (p. 163).

This reformers' view of a classroom is one easily embraced by educators of gifted students. Many of the programs developed for learners of high ability have been created as a way to free these mentally energetic students from lethargic learning environments. In fact, a source of tension for reformers about gifted education is a sort of separatist or elitist aura that they believe accompanies pulling one group of students out of an undernourishing environment, taking them to another setting for adequate nourishment, and leaving the others behind. As one participant said, "It's a way to get achieving kids out of dysfunctional schools . . . . But all kids come to school with talents, and they all deserve our best."

Many educators of gifted students would respond that even a classroom that is engaging for typical learners is likely to fall short of addressing the needs of students who differ markedly from the norm in readiness unless multiple learning options are carefully planned. Nonetheless, these

same educators would also concur that having a robust and healthy classroom as a starting point would be highly desirable for *all* learners, including those who are gifted.

Common Elements, Shared Contributions

There is no doubt that the pedagogy of gifted education is exciting and desirable for all children. Indeed, many of the general principles that have governed instruction for gifted learners in the past would enliven learning for all students. These principles provide common ground on which educators of gifted students and educational reformers can join efforts aimed at revitalizing schooling. Among these principles are the following beliefs:

> If it's not the dream school for your child, it's not good enough for any child.
>
> **Henry M. Levin**

- The current situation in education is unworkable for many students, and improvement is necessary.
- We need to retool educators and education for the 21st century.
- Learning should be focused on more than acquisition of isolated facts.
- Learning should revolve around important problems and issues in a given field of study.
- Learning should be student centered, encouraging learners to be inquirers.
- Teachers should be facilitators of learning rather than merely dispensers of data.
- Students should consistently engage in both critical and creative thinking.
- Students should create products that address real problems and demonstrate understanding of ideas and applications.
- Students should grow in awareness of their own thinking and problem-solving strategies.
- Student interest should be important in instructional planning.
- Basic skills, skills of production, skills of research, and skills of a discipline should be integrated appropriately into student tasks.
- Students should learn to work cooperatively and independently.
- Students should learn to be effective evaluators of their own work.
- Teachers should hold high expectations for learners and set high standards.
- Students should work hard.
- Teachers should appropriately use a variety of instructional strategies that facilitate these goals.

Both educators of gifted students and school reformers endorsed these and related goals as essential for all classrooms. These ideas set forth important common ground, and they are easy to agree upon. Moreover, both groups of educators acknowledged each other's contributions to the development of such classrooms. Both groups have backgrounds and experiences in education that have focused on the theory and practice that support the goals. Both have access to programs, classrooms, and schools where these principles are enacted. Both have rich experience in professional development and have garnered understandings about the kinds of opportunities most likely to encourage teachers to consider and implement alternate visions of "doing school."

The distance to be traveled before such classrooms are the rule in the United States rather than the exception is considerable. The size of the task dictates cooperation toward the goal. The existence of such a significant set of common beliefs certainly provides opportunity for development of dialogue, exploration, mutual understanding, and trust.

Uncertain Dimensions, Unresolved Issues

Because of the basic equity and excellence values of school reform and gifted education, there remain points of tension related to a vision of effective classrooms, even in the midst of essential agreement. It is unrealistic to ignore them, just as it would be unrealistic to dismiss the considerable opportunities for collaboration.

Many reformers believe that if high expectations and high standards exist in a classroom, everyone is well served. Many in gifted education believe that a common content, common set of activities, and common product will fall short of challenging students who are very advanced in a given domain. While it is easy for educators of gifted students to embrace the use of high-level

thinking in classroom discussions and tasks, for example, they would contend that a 12 year old with advanced talent in math needs more advanced opportunities in algebra than does a 12 year old who finds math difficult to grasp. The advanced learner, these educators would say, may need a faster pace, more abstract or complex content presented in ways that require more advanced thinking, and more advanced applications than a peer for whom math is not an area of high ability.

Because the driving perspective of reform is equity, reformers are particularly concerned that all students should have the opportunity to take the algebra class, rather than being assigned to a class that might limit the student's future learning opportunities. Reformers are suspicious of something that is "more advanced," believing that such opportunities dilute general offerings.

Because the driving perspective of gifted education is high-end excellence, educators of gifted learners want to be sure that they have the opportunity to learn as broadly and deeply as their abilities allow. These educators are suspicious of any one-size-fits-all agenda because of the belief that any single standard will have to be set lower than is appropriate for an advanced learner in order to make it accessible to the general student population.

The differences are real, but they are not insurmountable. Both groups have an interest in developing classrooms in which high expectations and rigorous curricula are the norm. In that setting, it would be possible to conduct research that examines (a) the impact of the enriched curricula on students whose readiness levels vary, (b) methods of providing for individual differences in such a classroom, and (c) strategies for raising both floors and ceilings in a single setting.

To date, there have been so few high-expectations classrooms and so little collaboration between the school reform movement and gifted education that we really do not know the degree to which rich classrooms maximize the capacity of learners of high ability, and we do not fully understand strategies that would be effective in addressing student differences in such settings. There is room for learning from one another—for learning together.

> We must honor all types of learners and work to meet these children's needs in the least restrictive environment with a continuum of services.
>
> **Gayle Pauley**

> Gifted education has a wealth of experience that can be utilized in reform. They should be welcomed at the table rather than viewed with skepticism.
>
> **Judy Aaronson**

CHAPTER 3

Sources of Power for Change

"Changing the regularities in the classroom is a very complex, demanding, and personally upsetting affair, even when motivation is high" (Sarason, 1990, p. 90). The nemesis of educational change efforts for most of this century has not been the gap between school reform and gifted education, but rather the chasm that continues to exist between the vision for change and the intractable patterns of day-to-day educational practice.

Some of the conversation at the symposium centered around building connections between reform goals and current realities of schooling. The connections appear equally imperative for school reform and for instructional adjustments necessary for gifted learners. Connection-building experiences from the two groups led to similar conclusions and to another area of common ground.

The Pull from the Top Versus the Pull from the Bottom

One major issue in the conversation revolved around the role of top-down versus bottom-up approaches to change. Both educators of gifted students and school reformers concurred that neither could be neglected as an impetus for change.

Top-down or centralized mandates or motivation for change are often necessary to set the change process in motion. A leader or visionary, whether a group or an individual, can often be effective in launching an idea, establishing standards, providing support, and assessing progress. This has been true both in establishing general reform efforts and in ensuring appropriate education for gifted learners. Evidence of the impact of groups and individuals using the power of position, knowledge, experience, or authority as a catalyst for change was common to such reformers as Henry Levin and his associates in creating the Accelerated Schools Project and Theodore Sizer and his associates in developing the Coalition of Essential Schools. Gifted child educators, too, use the power of leadership, as seen in the programs for gifted students in Detroit, where coordinator Bessie Duncan has created new and varied learning options for learners of high ability throughout the district, and in Kentucky, where leaders in gifted education have worked to ensure provisions for gifted learners in state reform legislation.

While there were important examples of positive educational change sparked in places other than "the front lines," symposium members agreed that top-down or centralized change agents are limited in their capacity to achieve long-lasting, meaningful change. "If there is one cardinal rule of change in the human condition, it is that you cannot *make* people change. You cannot force them to think differently or compel them to develop new skills" (Fullan, 1993, p. 126). Unless front-line educators themselves become convinced of the need for

> Time is our most serious obstacle. Systems must figure out ways to allow educators to problem-solve, plan, and implement needed changes.
>
> **Susan Lamar**

change, efforts in that direction will be short lived and replete with frustration. At the Wye symposium, reformers and gifted child educators concurred that durable and significant change will ultimately take its energy and form from teachers who are willing to risk innovation.

The kind of sweeping changes sought by school reform and also necessary for gifted learners to maximize their potential may begin with a mandate or top-down initiative, but that is the easy part. What follows must be a cadre of committed practitioners willing to confront problems, negotiate solutions among themselves and with leaders, and learn new practices even as they unlearn old habits. Too much centralization leads to overcontrol. Too much decentralization leads to chaos (Fullan, 1993; Sarason, 1990).

In working out the relationship between gifted education and school reform, these principles apply. Leadership and policymaking in either arena can be a catalyst for positive change in both. Ultimately, however, change that addresses both sets of needs will require collaboration at the local, school, and classroom levels in order to assist practitioners in developing classrooms that are encouraging and demanding for all learners, including those with advanced abilities.

Shared Lessons on Change

Several lessons on change were learned from experiences shared at the Wye symposium. First, state and local policy must provide the administrative, structural, and legal supports needed to ensure that schools change in ways that address the special learning needs of all children.

Second, education policy has to provide support for both the practice and the practitioner. Support may include adjustments in class size so that teachers can know their students well; time for teachers to plan, think, and read; flexibility in scheduling so that larger blocks of time are available for students and teachers to work together; collaboration among practitioners who can share skills; opportunities to observe in settings with promising practices; and support for positive risk taking by teachers.

Third, appropriate school reforms—including addressing needs of advanced learners—must center on local-level strategies for advocacy, parent involvement, and reciprocal professional development activities between those involved in school reform and gifted child educators with training in teaching in high-challenge and high-expectations classrooms.

Finally, the essential unit for creating appropriate educational reform and establishing a working relationship between reformers and educators of gifted students is the local school. Symposium participant Henry Levin, Director of the Accelerated Schools Project at Stanford University's Center for Educational Research, suggests that core values that enable fundamental change at the school level include a (a) unity of purpose in moving toward change, (b) school-site empowerment to make changes, and (c) building on student and school strengths as a vehicle for achieving positive change.

Breaking away from worn-out patterns of schooling will probably require inspired leadership and centralized administrative initiative and support, but the success or failure of new initiatives will depend upon persistent efforts of practitioners who are the real power sources of teaching and learning. If the gap that has persisted between the two groups is to close, it will do so because front-line practitioners are persistent in their insistence that bridging the gap makes more sense for education that does sustaining it.

CHAPTER 4

Expanding Perspectives: Inclusive Schools

Conversation at the symposium, as well as common sense, indicates that school reform and gifted education both have a major stake in expanding the horizon beyond old disagreements. Progress has to do with moving forward. In this instance, moving forward would also result in moving together. The focal point of forward progress is development of inclusive schools that move beyond slogans to specifically plan for and support all learners.

Expanding Perspectives in Gifted Education

There are several modifications in perspective that would serve to move gifted education both ahead and toward educational reformers. They are not arbitrary adjustments in belief, but rather stem from an evolving understanding of human development, cognitive psychology, brain research, and productive environments.

> We need to move our orientation toward developing giftedness rather than certifying it.
>
> **Joseph Renzulli**

Gifted education needs to move beyond its historic (and short-range) fixation on identification. As a field, gifted education has spent inordinate time and effort in determining who qualifies for programs for gifted students. The continual need to revisit how identification "works" signals root-level flaws in the identification model itself. The "cut-off" paradigm needs to be replaced with an inclusive focus. There are ample indications that current testing options fail to identify many highly able students in all populations. There is clear evidence that traditional testing and assessment mechanisms are especially flawed in their ability to seek out and identify talent in culturally diverse and low socioeconomic populations. In addition, there is mounting evidence that we have defined giftedness too narrowly and that gifted and talented education more broadly conceived calls for a more inclusive view of who would benefit from ability development.

Gifted education should adopt talent development as its primary focus. Resources previously invested in finding the "right" learners should be largely aimed at developing teaching strategies that can benefit many students. This does not indicate that a single program or instructional model will serve all learners alike. Rather, it indicates a need to understand how to encourage talent development in a variety of ways for learners whose gifts and talents at any given time appear modest and those whose gifts and talents appear more abundant. It means learning how to create instruction that is responsive to individual readiness, that charts growth from early stages to professional-level production, and that supports learners as they develop their talent along a learning continuum.

Expanding Perspectives in School Reform

As with the field of gifted education, the field of school reform should retrench from counterproductive perspectives and practices and evolve toward perspectives and practices that are more likely to include and benefit all learners.

> Although reform efforts build on excellence for all students, we must not lose sight of the unique needs of our high ability students.
>
> **Anonymous**

The school reform movement needs to expand its historic focus on learners who are at risk, understanding that all children are at risk of stunted capacity unless they are actively valued, understood, and nurtured. To exclude the needs of any group of students from the reform dialogue, whether through conscious intent or benign neglect, devalues those learners.

The reform movement also needs to embrace the fact that learners differ in interests, learning styles, culture, world view, readiness, and in many other ways. Restructured classrooms would, of necessity, eschew one-size-fits-all education. The goal is neither insipid learning for some and enriched learning for others nor a "magic bullet" that will address the needs of all learners in the same way. Rather, the goals should include offering varied avenues to high-level learning in response to student differences while maximizing the talents of all learners. Flexible use of time, varied resources, multiple sense-making opportunities, multiple modes of expressing learning, flexible grouping patterns, instruction based on assessment of readiness and interest, continually updated learning goals for individual students, and similar approaches should be hallmarks of a reform classroom that accepts students as they are and understands how to continually support them in development toward their potential.

A Common Perspective

For gifted education, delivery of services can no longer be envisioned as an add-on to the normal curriculum. Instead, developing ability in a variety of ways, with emphasis on the general classroom, must be the goal. For that approach to be viable, classrooms must be settings in which generalists and specialists collaborate to develop a variety of abilities, in a variety of ways, for students whose differences are as important as their likenesses.

CHAPTER 5

The Point of Balance: Becoming Student Centered

Schools that are genuinely inclusive serve both equity and excellence. They are interested in talent development in all its forms. They attend to students who are at risk and advanced learners, to remediation through acceleration, and to acceleration beyond the norm. They are student centered.

Perhaps the most solid conception of common ground between school reform and gifted education is the creation of learning environments that are authentically student centered. Student-centeredness is increasingly at the core of both gifted education and school reform agendas. A commitment to student-centeredness can open avenues for collaboration between the two groups of educators.

Sensitivity to Student Traits and Needs

The root system of a student-centered classroom is a teacher's skill in reading, interpreting, and responding appropriately to the traits and needs of individual learners. Such sensitivity would include careful and ongoing explorations of

- The student's home and community environment and their impact on self-confidence, motivation, readiness, interests, and other traits.
- The student's culture and its impact on how the student relates to education, school authority figures, peers, and the world.
- The student's interests and how those can serve as a foundation for learning.
- The student's strengths and how those can become a foundation for motivation and self-efficacy.
- The student's learning style preferences and how those can make learning more efficient and school more inviting.
- The student's readiness for learning and how appropriate challenges invite curiosity, engagement, and sound habits of mind.

Response through High-Level Learning Experiences

Teachers in student-centered classrooms would respond to individuals' profiles by designing high-level learning experiences tailored to varied traits and needs. Each child should encounter regular learning experiences that are interesting to and "just a little too hard" for him or her at a given point in that student's journey as a learner. Such high-level learning experiences would

- Be based upon key concepts and powerful ideas in a field of study.
- Require students to think about the key concepts and ideas both critically and creatively.
- Ensure that learners develop a solid knowledge base necessary for production and open access to additional learning in a subject area.
- Require students to be active, participatory learners.
- Require students to use knowledge to examine issues and solve problems.

- Help students develop attitudes, habits, and dispositions that promote intellectual curiosity and learning, including the valuing of hard work.
- Help students develop real-world skills of idea expression and production.
- Seem relevant to students.
- Be varied, to address individual readiness, interest, and learning preferences.

> You don't need a recipe book. What you need is to understand why you're doing things, how they are good for the learner, how they match the content you are teaching.
>
> **Bessie R. Duncan**

- Create varied sense-making activities to enable all learners to grapple with and internalize important ideas at appropriate levels of abstractness, complexity, independence, and open-endedness, as well as at a pace appropriate for the learner.
- Create varied product options through which students can apply and extend learnings at appropriate levels of abstractness, complexity, independence, and open-endedness, as well as at a pace appropriate for the learner, and through modes of expression that invite students to develop their talent areas.
- Use a wide variety of independent, small-group and whole-group learning options as appropriate to the task and learner.
- Join with students in developing criteria for products and other work that set high expectations for the group as a whole and are then extended to address interests and learning needs of the individual student.
- Guide students in personal goal setting and ongoing self-assessment related to those goals.

Tailoring Instruction to Fit the Learner

While all classrooms use whole-group activities as a means of establishing common learnings and building a community of sharing, there are also many times when differing learners have differing interests and needs. Therefore, a student-centered classroom would also provide many learning experiences designed to address varied interests, learning preferences, and points of readiness. While all learning experiences would meet criteria for high-level learning, teachers in a classroom where instruction is tailored to fit individuals would

- Help students recognize their own gifts and talents and define the steps necessary to develop those talents as fully as possible.
- Provide varied means of input or content, including multiple print resources, human resources, media resources, and learning by doing, as well as learning by reading or listening.
- Arrange supports for assimilating information, including reading buddies, graphic organizers, peer study teams, and peer mentors.
- Provide opportunities for acceleration and enrichment of learning tailored to the interests and needs of students.

School reformers have demonstrated that past instructional paradigms have been lifeless and ineffective with many learners, including those whom we now call "at risk." As the student population becomes more diverse in general, and as that diversity is represented in heterogeneous classrooms, it seems likely that any view of teaching that denies the pluralism is doomed to fail.

Establishing student-centered classrooms with high floors and high ceilings—classrooms in which many talents, many viewpoints, many learning styles, and many interests are legitimized—seems to be a goal acceptable to both educational reform and gifted education, because its focus is helping all students achieve their maximum potential.

CHAPTER 6

Dynamics of Design

Several means of moving toward achieving the goal of student-centered classrooms emerged from the conversation at the Wye symposium. Among them are reconfiguring time and rethinking staff development in ways that strengthen both educational practitioners and educational practice. Currently, structures of time and staff training often *drive* educational objectives. These two key resources need to be reconfigured so that they *serve* educational objectives, one of which is establishing classrooms that are responsive to a variety of learning needs.

Reconfiguring Time

Time is a key resource in building student-centered learning environments. Unfortunately, educations' current use of time is not typically most advantageous in moving toward student-centeredness.

One reformer reflected regarding the use of time in schools, "If we don't reconceptualize time, everything else is lost." Children don't all learn at the same pace, and not all tasks merit equal time. Yet our bell-driven schedules imply that small, equally sculpted blocks of time are adequate for all learners and learning tasks. Our current understanding of the learning process points us toward rethinking the resource of time to make it variable, flexible, and unfragmented.

First, we need to develop classrooms in which time is a variable rather than a constant. That is, some students may move through desired learnings quickly and then be supported in moving on to other explorations. Other students will require more time to internalize ideas and skills but will succeed in doing so if given extended time and support. Second, we need to develop classrooms in which time is flexible. That is, we need to empower teachers to use more time on some days to do a particular science investigation if it seems wise to do so and then perhaps omit science another day to keep the overall curriculum in balance. On the secondary level, there need to be opportunities for some learners to spend more hours a day in algebra while other learners may be able to enroll in two courses during the same class periods, negotiating with both teachers regarding days on which it is wisest to attend each class.

> We, in fact, have learning defined by time . . . What we need to do is adjust time to the learning. In the current system a student who takes seven repetitions to get it and a student who takes one repetition to get it . . . are treated exactly the same.
>
> **Barbie Halstead-Worrell**

Third, we need to reconfigure time into larger blocks. Doing so will allow all students to pursue ideas in greater depth, attach sense making to content, and have time for meaningful application of knowledge. In addition, it will allow opportunity for teachers to provide learning extension and reinforcement for students more easily and naturally than is possible in shorter blocks of time.

Making time in school more variable, flexible, and unfragmented is an acknowledgment of differing student interests and needs. School days need not necessarily be extended for educators to use the resource of time more responsively to the needs of students.

Rethinking Staff Development

Current staff development models—typically an "expert" telling practitioners how to use the latest educational innovation in their classrooms—have proven ineffective in changing educational practice. The goal of student-centeredness would be greatly enhanced by staff development that is more reflective, collaborative, and immediate than has generally been the case in the past.

Reflective staff development would encourage individuals, teams of teachers, and staffs to develop a sense of identity and purpose in regard to their learners by supporting shared discussion of experiences, study and debate of a range of views on various facets of educational practice, and shared decision making regarding their work. It would resist telling teachers what to do and would focus more on helping them arrive at ways to think broadly and deeply about teaching and learning. It would opt for teachers as creative artists rather than as followers of recipes.

Collaborative staff development would support teachers' visiting one another, identifying and sharing areas of expertise or success. It would help generalists and specialists learn to respect one another's roles and work as effective teams. It would promote investigation of solutions to problems by teams of educators with varied perspectives and insights to contribute to the investigation.

Staff development that is "immediate" would take place in classrooms, with peers and outside experts working together to implement new approaches to teaching and learning. It would arise naturally and be supported by administrators, as teachers identify problems that they want to address or as they decide to implement new approaches in the classroom.

In other words, staff development would be learner centered when the teacher is the learner, exactly as we wish classrooms to be for children and youth. In the case of staff development, an administrator or team leader would play the teacher role by requiring goal setting. Then, based on their interests, skills, readiness, and learning preferences, teachers would be aided in developing learning opportunities tailored to fit.

> Professional development for all teachers must change dramatically. It must encourage teachers to practice themselves the kind of thinking we expect them to encourage in students.
>
> **Paula M. Evans**

> One of the things gifted education has done is develop teaching strategies as models . . ., but what we haven't focused on enough is the intellectual substance of those models and what the intellectual content should be.
>
> **Pat O'Connell-Ross**

Certainly there are other resources that are important in reformatting schools so that they are effectively student centered. Some schools and school districts are badly underfunded relative to other schools in the same district or state. Those inequities must be addressed. In fact, most U.S. schools are underfunded, resulting in class sizes that make meaningful student-centeredness a goal seemingly out of reach to many teachers. While having an immediate impact on funding formulas and structures seems beyond the scope of most teachers, schools, and even central administrations, educators at all levels do have the opportunity to reconfigure time and staff development in ways that could have immediate and positive impacts on developing classrooms that are responsive to individual student needs, interests, and readiness—classrooms that are better positioned to achieve the goals of both school reform and gifted education.

CHAPTER 7

From Imbalance to Balance: Hanging Together

As the Wye symposium concluded, participants distilled insights from experience and conversation, looking at three key areas that have the capacity to both block collaborative efforts between school reform and gifted education and link the two in a common purpose. These barriers and bridges can be categorized under the headings of attitudes, structures, and focus. Participants were first asked to summarize those factors of attitude, structure, and focus that are barriers to cooperation between gifted education and school reform. Next they were asked to make recommendations for positive steps that could result in bridges where barriers had previously been erected.

Barriers to Cooperation

Attitudes as Barriers

It was evident from the responses of the participants that feelings, values, and attitudes have built sturdy walls between educators of gifted students and school reformers. Each group has perceived the other as distant and unapproachable. Among attitudinal barriers that participants listed were

- Entrenched positions; unyielding stances.
- Mistrust.
- Unwillingness to compromise.
- Frozen methodologies.
- Lack of empathetic listening.
- Lack of forums for dialog.
- Failure to recognize common ground.
- Strong egos.
- Biased research.
- Fear of change.
- Defensive postures.
- An "us versus them" perspective.
- Lack of professionalism in dealing with one another.

Structures as Barriers

Beyond individual and group tensions, the infrastructures of education itself have played a part in separating gifted education and school reform. Among the structures named by participants as barriers were

- Entrenched educational bureaucracies.
- Entrenched paradigms of schooling.
- Failure to embrace a wide variety of models and strategies for classroom use.
- Counterproductive use of time.
- Funding limitations.
- Political policy decisions that run counter to educational good judgment.
- Insistence on uniformity.
- Insistence on grouping or no grouping of students as the only appropriate strategy.
- Insistence on equity or excellence as the only important goal.

Focus as a Barrier

Educators in both gifted child education and school reform tend to have focal points of concentration. Participants suggested that some of those areas of concentration have been so intense as to inhibit recognition that other priorities might exist

as well. Among the barriers of focus described were

- Emphasis on student needs to the neglect of attending to teacher needs.
- Emphasis on student differences to the neglect of emphasizing student similarities.
- Emphasis on student similarities to the neglect of emphasizing student differences.
- Emphasis on particular models or strategies to the neglect of the wide range of possible models and strategies available for effective school and classroom use.
- Overemphasis of "horror stories" and "success stories" without looking at a representative larger picture of programs and strategies.

Steps to Building Bridges

While the barriers of attitude, structure, and focus that have divided gifted education and school reform are significant, participants were also able to envision ties that might be made in those same areas—actions that might begin to join rather than divide the two groups. These suggestions offer promising next steps for educators of the gifted and school reformers who see benefit in working together for common goals.

Attitudes as Ties

Old arguments constructed on the foundation of old hostilities are unproductive. While attitudes are real and often deeply held, they are not impossible to alter over time. Symposium participants made the following suggestions for replacing attitudes as barriers with attitudes as ties:

- Start talking about collaborative efforts with people with whom you already have an open dialog.
- Make sure all new initiatives are collaborative ones.
- Role play the positions of groups and individuals other than your own.
- Listen.
- Use case studies as a means of establishing dialog.
- Develop local and regional networks with people outside of your own educational practice.
- Develop ongoing, long-term dialog to avoid being "zapped by the episodic."
- Focus on school-level cooperation and dialog.
- Develop concrete examples of ways in which learners who are gifted can be served within the context of school reform.
- Develop qualitative studies on the impact of varied educational settings and practices with learners who are gifted.
- Be a part of assisting educators with developing student-centered classrooms, recalling that people are more likely to act their way into thinking than they are to think their way into acting.
- Decide on the nonnegotiables, and do not be overly concerned with the less important issues.

Structures as Ties

An early area of common ground between school reformers and gifted child educators at the Wye symposium was recognition that many past and current educational structures are ill suited to today's classrooms and learners, as well as to dialog between reformers and educators of gifted students. It is logical, then, that together the two groups could develop new structures that would benefit both learners and the chances of collaboration. Some suggestions follow:

- Concentrate time and energy on awareness-level activities as a way to provide accurate information and shared understanding among policymakers, parents, educators, students, educators of gifted students, and school reformers.
- Lead the way in establishing collaborative models in which educators of gifted students and school reformers work together at the school and local level to identify and achieve shared goals.
- Work together to build interdisciplinary curricula that offer wholeness, relevance, power, and opportunity for interest-based study for all learners.
- Work together to reconfigure use of time in school in ways that benefit learning for all students.
- Establish collaborative staff development options through which teachers can become a part of shared problem solving efforts to establish schools and classrooms where both equity and excellence are valued.

Focus as a Tie

Groups that differ in basic perspectives may never agree on all matters. They can, however, identify focal points on which coming together is

mutually beneficial. Participants suggested the following as potential areas of shared focus:

- Give up on the grouping—no grouping argument.
- Rally together around the idea of helping all students achieve their maximum potential rather than the idea of achieving minimum competency.
- Establish positive dialogues at local and state levels as well as through professional organizations such as ASCD, AERA, NCTM, and NCTE.
- Conduct research and publish findings about varied uses of educational practices to promote high-quality education for all students.
- Use the Internet or other computer communications networks as well as personal publications, newsletters, newspapers, and professional presentations, to share examples of success as well as the ongoing dialog.
- Develop a philosophical statement of common ground and disseminate it to colleagues throughout the various educational fields.

Shifting the rhetoric between gifted child education and school reform so that it reflects openness and regard rather than antagonism and disregard is an important first step. It may well be, however, that the step of shared action will best facilitate mutual understanding. Options for such action and for a shift in rhetoric offered by symposium participants provide only a partial list of possibilities. It will be most useful if the symposium serves as a catalyst for conversation and an impetus for expanded collaboration at local schools, in professional organizations, and in policy-making settings. It is the hope of the symposium participants that by sharing their brief conversation with other educators willing to overcome old tensions, extended conversations will take place across the country and extended opportunities for shared learning will be realized.

> We came away with two messages: To those in the reform movement, we wish to point out that the education of gifted students can be a significant element in your program without impeding the reforms that are desired; to those in gifted education, the reform movement is not to be feared, but to be joined in a cooperative and imaginative spirit of collaboration.
>
> **James J. Gallagher**

A Final Note

It is evident that there are both room and opportunity for a healing of old animosities and grievances that have existed between school reformers and educators of gifted learners, both room and opportunity for new collaborations toward common and critical educational goals. A final note to members of each group may point the way to continued conversation and cooperation.

To Educational Reformers

High-ability learners exist in classrooms across the country. Their education can be an item on the reform agenda without impeding the equity goals of reform. Their needs have a rightful and valuable place on the continuum of instructional services.

In addition, educators of gifted learners are a skilled and valuable resource in establishing classes with high expectations for all learners, a focus on critical and creative thought, problem- and issue-based instruction, relevant products, and many other elements desired by proponents of restructured classrooms. They are also a resource for establishing collaborative instruction between generalists and specialists in education. They want to be a part of and make a contribution to improving school for all learners.

To Educators of Gifted Learners

School reform should not be feared. It provides a significant opportunity for improving education for all students. Educators of gifted students would do well to take the first steps toward

continuing the dialog with reformers. If you are not "invited to the table," take the risk of inviting yourself.

It is also incumbent upon educators of gifted children to carefully and thoughtfully articulate the differences between good education for all learners and good gifted education. For a time, gifted education was the only advocate of issue-based, interdisciplinary instruction with a focus on high-level thinking, problem solving, and production of meaningful products. Now, and appropriately, those have become goals for all learners. While educators of gifted students can provide models for such high-expectation classrooms in general, it is imperative that they also develop and share models for differentiated instruction that guide practitioners in expanding expectations so that they are also high for advanced learners. While all students should analyze and create, a student with high-end talent in a given subject would likely benefit from analysis and creation via tasks and products that are more complex, abstract, open-ended, multifaceted, and independent than those that are appropriate for learners whose talent is less advanced in that subject.

Educators of gifted students have a unique opportunity to share current models and strategies of instruction to the betterment of all students. They also have an obligation to continue to develop their understandings of precisely what makes instruction appropriate for gifted learners, and to share those understandings with colleagues who will be the primary instructors of those students.

To Both Groups

It is difficult to imagine a time in U.S. education more replete with challenge and opportunity.

It is difficult to imagine any groups of educators better equipped by virtue of vision and experience to contribute to the improvement of U.S. education for all learners.

It is difficult to imagine the degree of loss to schools and children that will occur if dialogs such as the one at this symposium do not continue and flourish.

References

Brady, M. (1989). *What's worth teaching: Selecting, organizing and integrating knowledge.* Albany: State University of New York.

de Tocqueville, A. (1840). *Democracy in America.* New York: Knopf.

Fullan, M. (1993). Innovation, reform, and restructuring strategies. In G. Calweti (Ed.), *Challenges and achievements of American education* (pp. 116–133). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Gardner, J. (1961). *Excellence: Can we be excellent and equal too?* New York: Norton.

Goodlad, J. (1984). *A place called school: Prospects for the future.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hofstadter, R. (1970). *Anti-intellectualism in American life.* New York: Knopf.

Marland, S. (1972). *Education of the gifted and talented* (Report to the Congress of the United States, Commissioner of Education). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Nehring, J. (1989). *"Why do we got to do this stuff, Mr. Nehring?": Notes from a teacher's day in school.* New York: Fawcett Columbine.

Sarason, T. (1990). *The predictable failure of educational reform.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sizer, T. (1992). *Horace's school. Redesigning the American high school.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Toch, T. (1991). *In the name of excellence.* New York: Oxford University Press.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An educational strategy sourcebook.* Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: An imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (1993). *National excellence: A case for developing America's talent.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (1971). *Education of the gifted and talented.* Washington, DC: Author.

Welsh, P. (1986). *Tales out of school.* New York: Viking.

APPENDIX A

List of Participants

Gifted Education and School Reform:
Making the Connection
May 19–22, 1994

Judy Aaronson
Executive Assistant to the Deputy Superintendent
Center for Systemic Educational Change
District of Columbia Public Schools
415 12th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
202/724-4099

George E. Ayers
Executive Director
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9400

Joseph Ballard
Assistant Executive Director
Department of Public Policy
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9406

Terri Bawden
Gifted/Professional Development Center Coordinator
North Central Educational Service District
P.O. Box 1847
Wenatchee, WA 98807-1847
509/664-0359

Sandra L. Berger
Dissemination Specialist
The National Training Program for Gifted Education
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9471

Bruce Boston
President
Wordsmith, Inc.
11432 Waterview Cluster
Reston, VA 22090
703/437-0999

Jean Boston
Director of Publications
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9468

Ann Boultinghouse
Curriculum Generalist/Gifted Consultant
Keystone Area Education Agency
1473 Central Avenue
Dubuque, IA 52001
319/556-3310

Patricia Free Brett
Director, Community Outreach & Leadership Development
Quality Education for Minorities Network
1818 N Street, NW Suite 350
Washington, DC 20036
202/659-1818

Joyce Bruce
Curriculum Specialist 6-8
Hoyt Middle School
2700 East 42nd Street
Des Moines, IA 50317
515/265-7395

Michael S. Caldwell
Director, Bureau of Educational Research
Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
405 Emmett Street
Charlottesville, VA 22903-2495
804/924-7341

Jeanette Covington
Education Specialist, II
Division of Gifted/Talented Education
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701
512/463-9455

Caroline Cunningham
Doctoral Student
Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
405 Emmett Street
Charlottesville, VA 22903
804/971-8356

Elaine K. Dumas
Librarian
Central High School
484 Ridgeway
Little Rock, AR 72205
501/324-2314

Bessie R. Duncan
Program Supervisor
Gifted and Talented Education
Detroit Public Schools
5057 Woodward, Room 956
Detroit, MI 48202
313/494-0399

Arthur Ellis
Assistant Commissioner
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax
Denver, CO 80203
303/866-6679

Paula M. Evans
Director
National ReLearning Faculty
Coalition of Essential Schools
Brown University
Providence, RI 02912
401/863-1487

James J. Gallagher
Kenan Professor of Education
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
300 NCNB Plaza, Suite 301
137 East Franklin Street
Chapel Hill, NC 27514
919/962-7373

Julie Gonzales
Chair, Colorado State Advisory Committee
7266 South Newport Way
Englewood, CO 80112
393/741-4764

Barby Halstead-Worrell
Director of Teacher TV
National Education Association
National Center for Innovation
1201 16th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
202/822-7056

Gail E. Hanninen
President, CEC-TAG
Chimacum School District
Chimacum, WA 98325
206/732-4285

Kathy Hargrove
Director, Gifted Students Institute and Pre-College Programs
Southern Methodist University
Box 750382
Dallas, TX 75275-0382
214/768-5437

E. Lowell Harris
Director, Exceptional Children Support Team
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919/715-1565

Jody Hess
Program Manager, Tacoma School District
P.O. Box 1357
Tacoman, WA 98401
206/596-1156

Evelyn L. Hiatt
Director
Division of Gifted/Talented Education
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, TX 78701-1494
512/463-9455

Walter E. Jackson
Superintendent
Durango 9-R School District
2605 County Road, 203
Durango, CO 81301
303/247-5411

APPENDIX A

Henry L. Johnson
Assistant State Superintendent for Instructional Services
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919/715-1506

Felice A. Kaufmann
Director
The National Training Program for Gifted Education
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9463

Susan Lamar
President
North Carolina Association for the Gifted and Talented
169 Candlewood Road
Rocky Mount, NC 27804
919/985-2764

Erika Landberg
Ward 3 Representative
D.C. Board of Education
415 12th Street, NW Room 1101
Washington, DC 20004
202/724-5457

Henry M. Levin
David Jacks Professor of Higher Education
School of Education
Center for Educational Research at Stanford Building
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-3084
415/723-0840

Sylvia Lewis
Consultant, Gifted Education
Exceptional Children Support Team
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction
301 North Wilmington Street
Raleigh, NC 27601-2825
919/715-1999

Frances Luckett-Butler
Assistant Director (Acting)
Gifted and Talented Education Program
Nalle Administrative Unit
50th and C Streets, SE
Washington, DC 20019
202/767-7033

Judith Martin
Educational Specialist
Education Service Center, Region 20
1314 Hines Avenue
San Antonio, TX 78208
210/299-2400 ext. 114

Shelia J. Mingo
Senior Director
Grants/Contracts and Research
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9405

Judy S. Minnehan
Coordinator, Gifted Education
Fayette County Schools
701 East Main Street
Lexington, KY 40502
606/281-0184

Thirza G. Neal
Director Gifted/Talented Education Program
Nalle Administrative Unit
50th and C Streets, SE
Washington, DC 20019
202/767-7033

Charles Patterson
Superintendent of Schools
Killeen Independent School District
Box 967
Killeen, TX 76540
817/520-1309

Gayle Pauley
Supervisor, Gifted and Talented
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
206/753-2858

Rosalind Philips
Research & Technology Manager
Washington State Commission on Student Learning
P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200
206/664-3155

Frank Rainey
State Consultant, Gifted and Talented Education
Colorado Department of Education
201 East Colfax Avenue
Denver, CO 80203
303/866-6849

Bruce A. Ramirez
Associate Executive Director
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9404

Joseph S. Renzulli
Director
National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented
The University of Connecticut
362 Fairfield Road, U-7
Storrs, CT 06269-2007
203/486-5279

Julia Roberts
Director, The Center for Gifted Students
Western Kentucky University
One Big Red Way
Bowling Green, KY 42101
502/745-6323

Karen Rogers
Associate Professor of Gifted Studies
University of St. Thomas
Graduate School of Education, Professional
Psychology, Social Work
131 CHC, 2115 Summit Avenue
St. Paul, MD 55105
612/962-5386

Cassandra Rosado
Policy Specialist for Government Relations
The Council for Exceptional Children
1920 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091
703/264-9409

Pat O'Connell Ross
Director, Javits Gifted & Talented Education Program
Room 504, OERI—U.S. Department of Education
555 New Jersey Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20208
202/219-2169

Emily D. Stewart
Supervisor,
Gifted & Talented Education and Schoolwide
Enrichment
Harford County Schools
23 North Main Street
Bel Air, MD 21014
410/838-7300 ext. 291

Carol Ann Tomlinson
Assistant Professor of Educational Studies
Room 287 Ruffner Hall
University of Virginia
405 Emmett Street
Charlottesville, VA 22903
804/982-2963

Stuart Tonemah
President
American Indian Research and Development, Inc.
2424 Springer Drive, Suite 200
Norman, OK 73069
405/364-0656

William Waack
Director of Teacher Education
University of Northern Iowa
159A Schindler Education Center
Cedar Falls, IA 50614-0602
319/273-2265

Charles E. Whaley
Coordinator for Gifted and Talented Education
Kentucky Department of Education
CPT 1718, 500 Mero Street
Frankfort, KY 40601
502/564-2672

Frank Withrow
Director of Learning Technologies
Council of Chief State School Officers
One Massachusetts Avenue, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001-1431
202/336-7003

Leland Wolf
Consultant, Gifted Education
Bureau of Instructional Services
Iowa Department of Education
Grimes State Office Building
Des Moines, IA 50319-0146
515/281-3198

APPENDIX B

ERIC Digest and Mini-Bibs

Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 Association Drive • Reston, VA 22091-1589
1-800-328-0272 • 703-264-9474 • FAX 703-264-9494

ERIC Digest

June 1994 **EDO-EC-93-8**

E525

Blending Gifted Education and School Reform

Gail E. Hanninen

School reform initiatives have resulted in many changes in American education during the past decade. The complexity of the process has presented numerous challenges for every educator. Juxtaposed against the reform climate are several other changes that have affected American classrooms: changing demographics, increasing diversity of student populations, and limited fiscal resources. It is within this broad context that the needs of our most capable youth must be challenged. This digest provides a process for assuring that the unique needs of students who are gifted are addressed within the context of systemic reform. Several key elements guide the process: creating belief statements, clarifying the issues, and designing strategies for implementation.

Creating Belief Statements

Belief statements define systemic parameters as reflected in a district's vision statement and expected outcomes. For example, what is believed about students who are gifted is based on what is believed about all learners. Creating belief statements about all learners is guided by the following questions:

1. What do we believe (about all learners)?
2. What do we know?
3. What do we want?
4. What do we do?

Processing these questions generates a set of district or school level belief statements, vision statements, and expected outcomes that will affect the entire community. Discussion should include educators and parents of students who are gifted and talented as well as other representatives from various special interests groups. By working individually, in small groups or as a whole, each person generates belief statements. The general discussion provides an opportunity to examine beliefs individuals hold about students who are gifted and talented. Through a process of narrowing down the statements, each small group lists five most strongly held statements. Later, when groups combine their statements, a list of 10 to 15 strongly held belief statements provides an organizational profile. A second list of belief statements may also be generated around the question, "What do you believe about programs for students who are gifted/talented?"

Clarifying the Issues

To understand elements of systemic change, each educator needs to clarify the issues. Again, a key question guides the process: "As you reflect upon what you know about education reform, the best practices in education, and your experience with students who are gifted/talented, what are the critical issues that come to your mind?" Identifying the five most important critical issues helps narrow the topics of concern and focus discussion.

Designing Strategies

Developing a successful relationship between education reform efforts and gifted education is linked to five key strategies:

1. **A**nalyze the language.
2. **L**ist key decision makers, stakeholders, and risk takers.
3. **I**nfuse gifted/talented into several school policies.
4. **V**isualize the desired direction.
5. **E**nact equitable access to resources.

The acronym "ALIVE" means that each strategy incorporates valuable information gleaned in one of the other strategies and does not function in isolation.

Analyze the language refers to interpreting what is *really* being said. For example, the concept of *inclusionary programs* sounds very altruistic, but might mean "inclusion of special education students only" in the regular school setting. In this example, students such as those being served by Chapter 1 programs, gifted programs, or English as a Second Language (ESL) programs may continue to be excluded from inclusive schools because the terminology has multiple meanings.

Language in vision statements, district policies, and expected outcomes can also be used to benefit students who are gifted. The following statement of purpose uses several helpful words and phrases: "The purpose of the British Columbia school system is to enable learners to *develop their individual potential* and to acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to *contribute to* a healthy society and a *prosperous and sustainable economy*" (Ministry of Education, 1991). Words like "individual," "each," and "potential" are inviting. Collective words such as "all," "they" and "everyone" can be misleading. Finding terms that are links to systemic parameters is crucial to embedding special services in policy, linking a school system with the community, and developing a shared vision.

List key decision makers, stakeholders, and risk takers means identifying individuals and groups who are strategic influencers. The people most affected by school system changes need to be included in discussions from the beginning. The number of persons needs to be manageable. The group should represent a broad range of constituencies, including students, parents, teachers, administrators, and members of the community. When choosing community members, keep in mind that key individuals who have credibility with and the respect of their colleagues will influence support for change.

Infuse gifted/talented into several school policies implies that well-written local district policies provide a basis for developing quality program services for all students, including those who are gifted. Although services for students who are gifted need to be defined in a specific program policy, they should also be interspersed throughout broader policy statements on curriculum, instruction, counseling, special populations, parent involvement, and staff development.

The following excerpt from a local district policy statement reflects that community's beliefs and priority for programming: "Challenge their multiple intelligences and engage students with diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds." This example depicts a connectedness to the whole district and supports the district's need to address "multiple intelligences" and "diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds" of all students. Thus, infusing services that meet the needs of students who are gifted/talented into local policy statements can work two ways.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Visualize the desired direction means that within the context of the total school system, design a clearly stated and concise framework for delivering services to students who are gifted. Such a design should challenge the future and illustrate not only a relationship of such services to the total system, but also provide accountability for a continuum of services from kindergarten through 12th grade.

Enact equitable access to resources means using the first four strategies to build equitable access to resources in a defensible manner. The notion that the "squeaky wheel gets the grease" is often true because special interest groups have gained an audience and power. Comprehensive quality services to students are not developed by squeaky wheels, but instead are the result of well planned efforts reflecting the beliefs and commitments of several constituencies. Equitable access to resources also implies that resources are based on the needs of students and not solely on the needs of teachers or administrators.

By using these five key strategies, a healthy relationship with the different education reform efforts becomes possible. Each education reform strategy can be accepted by educators of the gifted as an opportunity rather than a barrier.

A Gifted Leadership Conference in the state of Washington demonstrated one way that using this process can generate strategies for blending gifted education and school reform. Participants identified eight education reform efforts affecting services to highly capable students. The resulting product, created by the 41 participants, was entitled "The Reform Movement: Where Do Gifted Students Fit?" (Fascilla, Hanninen, & Spritzer,, 1991). The following reform strategies, excerpted from the original publication, illustrate how bridges in thinking can be built between education reform and gifted education.

Grouping: Strategies for Success with Gifted Students

Six guidelines to use when considering grouping options (Rogers, 1991):

1. Students who are academically or intellectually gifted and talented should spend the majority of their school day with others of similar abilities and interests.
2. Cluster grouping of students within an otherwise heterogeneously grouped classroom can be considered when schools cannot support a full-time gifted program.
3. In the absence of full-time gifted program enrollment, students might be offered specific group instruction across grade levels, according to their individual knowledge acquisition in school subjects.
4. Gifted students should be given experiences involving a variety of appropriate acceleration-based options, which may be offered to gifted students as a group or on an individual basis.
5. Students should be given experiences which involve various forms of enrichment that extend the regular school curriculum, leading to the more complete development of concepts, principles, and generalizations.
6. Mixed-ability cooperative learning groups should be used sparingly, perhaps only for social skills development programs.

Outcomes-Based Education: Strategies for Success with Gifted Learners

1. Maintain programs for gifted until acceptable options are available, that is, acceleration, self-contained classes, or advanced classes.
2. Educate all staff so that they are able to identify and provide appropriate curriculum for gifted students.
3. Pretest before initial instruction, and provide gifted students credit for prior learning.
4. Provide an enriched curriculum for all students and acceleration and/or in-depth study for gifted students.
5. Ensure opportunities for flexibility in scheduling so that students can be appropriately grouped and regrouped.
6. Provide gifted students the opportunity to work with their academic or intellectual peers/mentors.
7. Match new learning experiences that capitalize on the students' strengths and interests to the expected student outcomes, and provide appropriate assessment options.
8. Match the curriculum to the student's learning rate.
9. Eliminate the ceiling on learning (i.e., if a student is ready to learn algebra in 5th grade, the system must not only permit it, it should support it).
10. Extend the depth and breadth of the lessons.

Within each education reform strategy, ideas were presented that respect the integrity of the research and assure appropriate learning opportunities for students who are gifted.

All students in our schools, including those who are gifted, deserve the best education we are capable of providing. On the one hand, education reform efforts reflect those approaches deemed necessary to accomplish that goal. On the other hand, gifted education has frequently been perceived as being the best in education provided only for "the best." If the aim of education reform is that all students should experience "gifted teaching," then the expertise and support of educators of the gifted should be a part of those efforts. Concurrently, all educators need to acknowledge that "gifted teaching" does not necessarily mean effectively "teaching the gifted." Knowing the difference depends upon understanding the nature of a student's gifts and talents. It also means placing greater value on each student's strengths.

The keys to successful education reform for students who are gifted results in educators and parents who can continually:

1. Evaluate the effectiveness of the education reform strategies used in their districts.
2. Review the quality and clarify the relationship of educational services for students who are gifted.
3. Understand the complexity of the "big picture" as different education reform strategies are institutionalized in schools and beliefs about services for students who are gifted are incorporated.

Education reform is an opportunity for professionals in gifted education to recognize what works, what does not work, where "hitchhiking" on the ideas of others is wise, and to understand the changes that are needed to assure excellence in learning and character development. An inevitable outcome will be better schools for all students.

Resources

Fascilla, P., Hanninen, G. E., & Spritzer, D. (Eds.). (1991). *The reform movement: Where do gifted students fit?* Olympia, WA: Gifted Leadership Conference, c/o OSPI.

Ministry of Education (1991). *Supporting learning: Understanding and assessing the progress of children in the primary program.* Province of British Columbia.

Rogers, K. (1991). *The relationship of grouping practices to the education of the gifted and talented learner: An executive summary.* Storrs, CT: The National Research Center on the Gifted and Talented.

Gail E. Hanninen, Ed.D. is Director, Student Learning and Assessment, Chimacum School District, Chimacum, WA 98325-0278. She also has served as CEC-TAG President.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RR93002006. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 Association Drive • Reston, VA 22091-1589
(703) 264-9474 • FAX (703) 264-9494

ERIC Mini-Bib

December 1993

Gifted Education and School Reform Selected Readings

EC606152
Dettmer, P. (1993). Gifted Education: Window of Opportunity. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 37*(2) 92-94.

This paper offers educators of gifted students 10 recommendations for encouraging change in the context of the movement for educational restructuring and reform. These include setting high learning standards and expectations for all students, structuring new roles for gifted education personnel, and integrating gifted education with general education in meaningful ways.

EC606209
Ford, D. Y. & Harris, J., III. (1993). Educational Reform and the Focus on Gifted African-American Students. *Roeper Review, 15*(4) 200-204.

This article discusses implications of educational reform movements for improving the educational well-being of gifted students in general and gifted African-American students in particular. Recommendations for educational improvements are offered in the areas of performance assessment, primary preschool programs, extended school services, family resource and youth services centers, and school-based decision making.

ED344409 EC301138
Frank, R. (Mar 1992). School Restructuring: Impact on Attitudes, Advocacy, and Educational Opportunities for Gifted and Talented Students. In: *Challenges in Gifted Education: Developing Potential and Investing in Knowledge for the 21st Century.* Columbus: Ohio State Dept. of Education.

Educational reform efforts toward school restructuring are examined for their impact on the education of gifted and talented students. Considered first are implications of societal changes including changing demographics (e.g., increasing student diversity), changes in family structure and in interactions between school and family, and changes in the workplace (requiring a better educated work force). A vision is offered of a restructured school where all students are challenged according to individual abilities and learning styles. Such a vision is seen to require changing attitudes with many community organizations becoming new stakeholders, with student diversity being celebrated, with curriculum reform throughout impacting at-risk students (including gifted at-risk students), with increased family involvement, with gifted and talented students engaged in active learning experiences like community service, and with development of school business partnerships. A multipronged advocacy base is proposed for the restructured school.

EJ427056 EC600511
Gallagher, J. J. (1991). Educational Reform, Values, and Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(1) 12-19.

The positive and negative elements of six educational reforms are discussed: search for excellence; cooperative learning; middle schools; master teacher certification; site-based management; and accountability. Gifted educators are urged to promote these reform movements for the maximum benefit of all.

ED344404 EC301133
Gallagher, J. J. (Mar 1992). Gifted Students and Educational Reform. In: *Challenges in Gifted Education: Developing Potential and Investing in Knowledge for the 21st Century.* Columbus: Ohio State Dept. of Education.

This paper examines gifted education in the context of current educational reform efforts. It offers a rationale for the differentiated education of gifted students based on American values and equitable allocation of educational resources. Examples are offered of curriculum content modification for math, science, language arts, and social studies which utilize four approaches: (1) acceleration, (2) enrichment, (3) sophistication, and (4) novelty. The relationship of gifted education to the America 2000 program and to the six national education goals is noted. The paper then reviews major reform efforts in the areas of accountability, the middle school concept, and cooperative learning. Issues remaining to be solved are also identified and include personnel preparation, unidentified students (e.g., the culturally different), curricular options, strategies and metathinking, and the value of the term, "gifted," itself.

EC 303107
Hanninen, G. (1994). *Blending Gifted Education and School Reform.* ERIC Digest #E525.

This digest provides a process for assuring that the unique needs of students who are gifted are addressed within the context of systemic educational reform.

EJ462591 EC605918
Jackson, N. E. (1993). Moving into the mainstream? Reflections on the study of giftedness. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 37*(1) 46-50.

This position paper calls for efforts to increase connections between studies of giftedness and mainstream psychological and educational research, arguing that studies of giftedness have contributed to mainstream theory and may play special roles in theory development. Strategies are proposed for overcoming barriers to further integration with mainstream research.

ED352782 EC301712
Maker, C. J., (Ed.) (1993). *Critical Issues in Gifted Education: Programs for the Gifted in Regular Classrooms. Volume III.* ISBN: 0-89079-549-5. Available from: PRO-ED, 8700 Shoal Creek Blvd., Austin, TX 78758-6897.

This book presents 29 papers addressing critical issues in the education of the gifted.

EJ427058 EC600513
Renzulli, J. S. & Reis, S. M. (1991). The Reform Movement and the Quiet Crisis in Gifted Education. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(1) 26-35.

Gifted education faces a quiet crisis as reform movements focus on cosmetic administrative changes in school organization and management rather than interaction among teachers, students,

and the material to be learned. Two goals of American education are presented: providing the best possible education to promising students and improving the education of at-risk students.

EJ439630 EC602502
Ross, P. (Fall 1991). Advocacy for Gifted Programs in the New Educational Climate. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(4) 173-76.

This article urges educators of the gifted and talented to become knowledgeable about educational reform efforts at the local, state, and national levels. Specific initiatives pertinent to gifted education include ungraded primary schools; performance-based assessment of student progress; use of student portfolios; and rigorous, revamped curricula.

EJ439630 EC302493
Ross, P. (1993). *National Excellence: A Case for Developing America's Talent.* Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), Programs for the Improvement of Practice. Available from: U. S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, P. O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250-7954; 202/783-3238. Order number 065-000-00603.

This report on the educational needs of American gifted and talented students identifies indicators of an educational crisis, describes the current status of education for these students, and presents recommendations to meet their educational needs. Indicators of the need for change include the relatively poor performance by American students on international tests and the small number of students performing at the high levels on National Assessment of Educational Progress tests. Studies have shown that most regular classroom teachers make few, if any, provisions for talented students and that only 2 cents out of every $100 spent on K-12 education supports special opportunities for talented students. A review describes how gifted and talented students are currently identified, the number of students served, the kind of support available, the kind of education most gifted and talented students receive, and characteristics of effective programs for these students. The following seven recommendations are offered:

1. Set challenging standards;
2. Provide more challenging opportunities to learn;
3. Increase access to early childhood education;
4. Increase learning opportunities for children who come from ethnically and culturally diverse or low socioeconomic backgrounds;
5. Broaden the definition of gifted (a broadened definition based on the federal Javits Gifted and Talented Education Act is offered;
6. Emphasize teacher development; and
7. Match world performance.

ED344408 EC301137
Stevens, M. (Mar 1992). School Reform and Restructuring: Relationship to Gifted Education. In: *Challenges in Gifted Education: Developing Potential and Investing in Knowledge for the 21st Century.* Columbus: Ohio State Dept. of Education.

This chapter reviews recent trends toward increasing emphasis on excellence in American business and applies these trends to school reform and restructuring in the context of gifted education. First, it notes the main ideas of recent business and education excellence studies which call for radical changes in the American education system. Examined is the dilemma of balancing the educational demands of equity and excellence especially in an age of major demographic shifts. A quality-oriented paradigm is proposed which merges equity and excellence and focuses on the individual, thus replacing the industrial model paradigm which focused on the "system." The issue of ability grouping is considered and research supporting within class grouping is cited. Concepts underlying the middle school approach are noted as another example where the equity/excellence dilemma and grouping concerns emerge. "Equifinality" is offered as a concept which suggests many potential ways to reach resolution, especially when the focus is always on the individual gifted learner and the teacher/facilitator.

EC605196
Tomlinson, C., & Callahan, C. (1992). Contributions of Gifted Education to General Education in a Time of Change. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 36*(4) 183-189.

Educators in gifted education should be involved in the School Reform Movement because of the need of gifted learners for positive changes in education and because of the potential of the field to contribute to improved education for all students. Philosophical contributions, instructional contributions, and pedagogical contributions of gifted education are examined.

EJ427055 EC600510
Treffinger, D. J. (1991). School Reform and Gifted Education—Opportunities and Issues. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(1) 6-11.

Efforts toward excellence and effectiveness in school programs should be viewed as a powerful opportunity for gifted education. Gifted educators should work toward expanding receptiveness to lessons learned from organizational research on innovation and change, effectiveness, and improvement, and educators should recognize that gifted education can make important contributions to these efforts.

EJ427057 EC600512
VanTassel-Baska, J. (1991). Gifted Education in the Balance: Building Relationships with General Education. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 35*(1) 20-25.

Gifted education depends on two linkages in its program development efforts: the special education linkage and the general education linkage. A closer working relationship with general education is recommended, along with careful consideration of the curriculum reform movement, basic research on teaching and learning, and effective schools research.

EC606738
Van Tassel-Baska, J. (1993) Linking Curriculum Development for the Gifted to School Reform and Restructuring. *Gifted Child Today, 16*(4) 34-37.

This paper compares academic performance of American students with that of other countries; addresses responses to poor performance, such as outcome-based approaches to learning and use of national standards; outlines practices being adopted by schools to promote reform; identifies curriculum reform principles; and discusses implications for gifted education at national, state, local, and classroom levels.

Note: This minibibliography is derived from *Gifted Students and Educational Reform*, a searchable database on diskette. The full database is available from The Council for Exceptional Children.

**** FINDING ERIC CITATIONS ****
References identified with an ED (ERIC document) number are cited in the ERIC database. Documents are available in ERIC microfiche collections at more than 825 locations worldwide. Documents can also be ordered through EDRS: (800) 443-ERIC. References with an EJ (ERIC journal) number are available through the originating journal, interlibrary loan services, or article reproduction clearinghouses: UMI (800) 732-0616, or ISI (800) 523-1850.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RR93002005. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ERIC®
Clearinghouse on Disabilities and Gifted Education
THE COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 Association Drive • Reston, VA 22091-1589
(703) 264-9474 • FAX (703) 264-9494

ERIC Mini-Bib

December 1993

Educational Restructuring Selected Readings

Alexander, F. (1993). National Standards: A New Conventional Wisdom. *Educational Leadership, 50*(5), 9-10.

Academic standards are central to reinventing schools and transforming U.S. education. Higher standards are necessary to replace minimal standards implicit in most textbooks and tests. Standards communicate that all students can achieve at higher levels and that teachers are reclaiming the profession. Standards also inspire systemic reform, create a demand for new improved assessments, and revitalize classroom experiences.

Ascher, C. (1993). *Changing Schools for Urban Students: The School Development Program, Accelerated Schools, and Success for All.* Trends and Issues No. 18. New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

This paper highlights three models for implementing local restructuring of schools: James Comer's School Development Program, Robert Slavin's Success for All, and Henry Levin's Accelerated Schools. These have been among the more popular models for restructuring schools in poor, predominantly minority neighborhoods with traditionally low-achieving students. Separate sections describe and analyze each of these programs individually. Further sections address important issues and themes common to all the programs. One of these sections discusses evaluation and assessment issues of both programs and students. A further section looks at the three models from the viewpoint of traditional assessments. A discussion of what causes improvements in learning notes that Comer's model is based on healing conflicts and creating an ethos that fosters identification and bonding and a community of trust, Slavin's model is more heavily cognitive, and Levin's format calls for active, intelligent participation of all members. Final sections review resources and costs for the various programs, and efforts at replication. An author bibliography is included.

Bell, T. (Apr. 1993). Reflections One Decade After "A Nation at Risk." *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(8), 592-97.

The intent of "A Nation at Risk" was to call attention to erosion of students' family lives, not to exonerate teachers. Reforms affecting only six hours of children's daily lives cannot succeed. Schools must reach out to help parents and child-care workers become skilled at incidental (informal) teaching. Other concerns include technology, staffing, the national education role, and private schools.

Conley, D. (1993). Restructuring: In Search of a Definition. *Principal, 72*(3), 12-16.

Differentiates among renewal, reform, and restructuring activities and intentions in education, highlighting conceptualizations that stress fundamental change. Defines "restructuring" as activities that change fundamental assumptions, practices, and relationships, both within the organization and between the organization and the outside world, in ways leading to improved student learning outcomes.

Conley, D. (1993). Managing Change in Restructuring Schools: Culture, Leadership, and Readiness. *OSSC Bulletin, 36*(7). Eugene, OR: Oregon School Study Council, 1787 Agate Street, Eugene, OR 97403.

Factors that can powerfully affect an educator's ability to manage school change are culture, leadership, and readiness. Movement from bureaucracy to community, from isolation to collaboration, involves cultural changes. Managing the change process within a cultural context is influenced by the structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames of reference that a leader employs when analyzing the organization. Leadership in schools continues to revolve around the role of principal. Principals need to develop a clear, unified focus, create a common cultural perspective, and support a constant push for improvement. Creating readiness for change is a precondition to restructuring. Several models suggest stages that leaders should understand before they begin a transformative change process. Ten commitments to change that a school staff might embrace are identified, and a series of questions are provided that can be used to assess current practices and ascertain which restructuring goals a school is ready to undertake. One effective means of building readiness is to provide staff the opportunity to visit schools that are actively involved in restructuring and ask questions about meaning, organization, and effects of change.

Cushman, K. (1993). "So Now What?" Managing the Change Process. *Horace, 9*(3), 1-12. Coalition of Essential Schools, Box 1969, Brown University, Providence, RI 02912.

School reform efforts require teaching teamwork and goal setting to school personnel. Describes a number of strategies for managing organizational change with examples at specific schools. Lists Coalition of Essential Schools materials.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1992). Reframing the School Reform Agenda: Developing Capacity for School Transformation. San Francisco: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.

Economic and demographic changes in the United States signal a new mission for education—one in which the schools are responsible for ensuring that all students learn. This paper argues that this changed mission requires a new paradigm for school reform policy, one that shifts from designing controls intended to di-

rect the system to developing capacity that enables schools to meet students' needs. Contradictions between the old and new paradigms are evidenced in different educational policy assumptions and goals. The first paradigm views students as passive, favors top-down governance, and uses research to design one best plan. The new paradigm recognizes that effective teaching techniques vary for different students and produces knowledge with and for teachers. Recommendations are made for reframing the school reform agenda with regard to the following three components of an infrastructure necessary to support lasting change: professional, policy, and political development. A conclusion is that the new paradigm for school reform must seek to develop communities of learning grounded in communities of democratic discourse in order to create an education for empowerment and freedom.

Deal, T. E. (1990). Reframing Reform. *Educational Leadership, 47*(8), 6-7, 9, 11-12.

Previous educational reform efforts have not made significant, lasting improvements because they focused on correcting visible structural flaws. Educational organizations are social organisms held together by a symbolic webbing, not formal systems driven by goals, official roles, commands, and rules. Deep structures and practices must be transformed, not reformed.

Fullan, M., & Miles, M. (1992). Getting Reform Right: What Works and What Doesn't. *Phi Delta Kappan, 73*(10), 744-52.

Instead of developing a new strategy for each reform wave, educators must learn how to foster continuous improvement. Reforms often fail because of faulty maps of change, complex problems, overreliance on symbols, superficial solutions, misunderstood resistance, attrition, and misuse of knowledge. Success means recognizing change as a systemic, resource-hungry, locally inspired journey into uncertainty and complex problem solving.

Levin, H., & Hopfenberg, W. (1991). Don't Remediate: Accelerate. *Principal, 70*(3), 11-13.

Accelerated Schools are built on the strengths of school staff, students, parents, and communities with the goal of bringing at-risk students into the educational mainstream by the end of elementary school. During the 1990-91 school year, 53 schools participated in the Accelerated Schools Program, including statewide networks in Missouri and Illinois.

Levin, H. (1991). Accelerating the Progress of ALL Students. Albany: Paper presented at the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government Educational Policy Seminar, November 8, 1990.

The Accelerated School Program is designed to improve the education of disadvantaged students by using "acceleration" techniques used with gifted and talented students. The goal is to speed up the learning of at-risk students so they will be able to perform at grade level by the end of elementary school. Central to the strategy is the placement of curriculum and instructional decisions in the hands of the instructional staff, requiring a complete restructuring of the traditional school organization. The emphasis on local responsibility for educational outcomes requires an appropriate decision-making structure built around the school's unity of purpose. The school must also develop the capacity to identify challenges, to understand these challenges, and to implement and evaluate solutions. Fifty schools nationwide have begun the six-year process needed to implement the accelerated school program. Cost estimates average about $1,000 per pupil per year. Although many issues regarding curriculum development, changing staff roles, and developing parent participation will require further exploration, the Accelerated Schools Model offers hope for closing the educational gap between America and other countries, and between the disadvantaged and the advantaged. Comments by T. P. Fitzgerald, Frances Kemmerer, and Steven D. Gold and a response by the presenter are included.

Muncey, D., & McQuillan, P. J. (1993). Preliminary Findings from a Five-Year Study of the Coalition of Essential Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan, 74*(6), 486-89.

Summarizes findings of a five-year study of eight schools participating in the Coalition of Essential Schools/Education of the States Re Learning project. Most schools appeared to lack consensus about the need for fundamental changes in school structure or teaching practices; changes began slowly, with individual or small-group efforts that frequently divided faculty.

Prager, K. (1993). Bibliography on School Restructuring. Madison, WI: Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools, University of Wisconsin, 1025 W. Johnson Street, Madison, WI 53706.

Much existing research and theoretical literature on school restructuring that is of interest to policymakers, practitioners, and educational researchers. In this publication, a bibliography of journal articles, manuscripts, and books is provided that divides the literature into five areas. Section 1, "General References on School Restructuring," contains 89 references on proposals for school reform (32), how schools work (24), and on the change process (33). Section 2, "Student Experience," contains 103 references on curricular and instructional reform (40), methods of grouping students (24), student engagement (11), and alternative assessment (28). Section 3, "Professional Life of Teachers," contains 35 references on analysis of teachers' work life (20), and proposals for enhancing the teaching profession (15). Section 4, "School Governance," contains 57 references on policy issues and new structures for accountability (15), school-site management (13), leadership (10), and school climate and culture (19). Section 5, "Collaboration Between Schools and Community," contains 20 references on policy issues (10), coordination of social services for children (7), business and school partnerships (4), and parent involvement (9). Contains an author index.

***Prisoners of Time: Report of the National Education Commission on Time and Learning* (1994). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, Stock #065-000-00640-5.**

This report details the findings of a national commission that looked at the relationship between time and learning in the nation's schools.

***School Restructuring: What the Reformers are Saying* (1991). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the United States.**

This publication summarizes a discussion among nationally recognized education reformers.

ERIC Digests are in the public domain and may be freely reproduced and disseminated.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RR93002005. The opinions expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the positions or policies of OERI or the Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COUNCIL FOR EXCEPTIONAL CHILDREN
1920 Association Drive
Reston, Virginia 22091-1589
1-800-232-7323

ISBN 0-86586-260-5

BEST COPY AVAILABLE